



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,487	10/15/2003	Gabriel A. Cohen	RSW920030181US1 (121)	8004
46320 7590 07/02/2007 CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE SUITE 3020 BOCA RATON, FL 33487			EXAMINER DEBROW, JAMES J	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/686,487

Applicant(s)

COHEN, GABRIEL A.

Examiner

James J. Debrow

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration:
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Appeal Brief filed 28 Feb. 2007.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 6 and 12 are independent claims.

Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal Brief or Reply Brief

3. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 28 Feb. 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new grounds of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:



**Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin et al. (Patent No.: US 7,174,512 B2; Filed Nov. 28, 2001) (hereinafter ("Martin')).**

In regards to independent claim 1, Martin discloses *a method for indicating input focus in a portal environment, the method comprising the steps of:*

assigning an unfocused style to all unfocused portlets in a portal except for a focused portlet having input focus (col. 3, lines 19-62; Martin disclose when a cell/portlet within the portal is deselected, the focus is gained by another cell/portlet. Thus, assigning an unfocus style to the portlet.).

further assigning a focused style to said focused portlet having input focus; rendering said focused and unfocused portlets in said portal (col. 3, lines 19-62; Martin disclose when a cell/portlet is selected, it gains focus. Martin disclose when a cell/portlet within the portal is deselected, the focus is gained by another cell/portlet. Thus, assigning an focus style to the portlet.).

responsive to a new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus from said focused portlet, re-assigning said focused style to said new portlet while re-assigning said unfocused style to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus, and re-rendering said new portlet and said focused portlet which no longer has input focus in said portal according to said styles (col. 3, lines 19-62; Martin disclose when a cell/portlet is selected, it gains focus. Martin also disclose when a cell/portlet within the portal is deselected, the focus is gained by another cell/portlet, thus, assigning an unfocus style to the cell/portlet. Therefore in response to a new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus from said focused portlet, inherently the process of re-assigning said focused style to said new portlet re-assigning said unfocused style to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus, and re-rendering said new portlet and said focused portlet which no longer has input focus in said portal according to said styles would occur.).

6. **Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fukuda et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0107449 A1; Pub. Date: Oct. 7, 2003) (hereinafter "Fukuda").**

In regards to independent claim 12, Martin discloses *a machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for indicating input focus in a portal environment, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions for causing the machine to perform the steps of (0102):*

assigning an unfocused style sheet to all unfocused portlets in a portal except for a focused portlet having input focus (0064; Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes that the style sheet is used to configure both focused and unfocused styles. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan that the unfocused style is typically considered as the default style and therefore may or may not be defined within the content style sheet specification.).

further assigning a focused style sheet to said focused portlet having input focus (0064; Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus, thus assigning a focused style sheet to said focused portlet having input focus.).

rendering said focused and unfocused portlets in said portal; and,
responsive to a new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus from said focused portlet, re-assigning said focused style sheet to said new portlet while re-assigning said unfocused style sheet to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus, and re-rendering said new portlet and said focused portlet which no longer has input focus in said portal according to said style sheets (0064; Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. In response to a new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus from said focused portlet, inherently the process of re-assigning said focused style to said new portlet re-assigning said unfocused style to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus, and re-

Art Unit: 2176

rendering said new portlet and said focused portlet which no longer has input focus in said portal according to said styles would occur.).

Note

7. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Gajewska et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0175951 A1; Pub. Date: Nov. 28, 2002) (hereinafter "Gajewska").**

In regards to dependent claim 2, Martin does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:*

defining a unique identifier in each portlet in said portal;
specifying a global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said focused portlet;
responsive to said new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus, re-
specifying said global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said new portlet.

However, Gajewska teaches *defining a unique identifier in each portlet in said portal* (0042; Gajewska discloses a Focus List which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request. Each list element has a "requester" member. The "requester" member contains data that identifies (*unique identifier*) a component (*portlet*) that at some point issues a focus request).

specifying a global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said focused portlet
(0042; Gajewska discloses a Focus List which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request. Each list element has a "requester" member. The "requester" member contains data that identifies (*unique identifier*) a component (*portlet*) that at some point issues a focus request); and,

responsive to said new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus, re-specifying said global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said new portlet (0043-0044; Gajewska discloses how a new "requester" member is added to the Focus List. The "requester" member contains data that identifies (*unique identifier*) a component (*portlet*) that at some point issues a focus request).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Martin with Gajewska for the benefit of maintaining a list of components requesting focus in a selected application (0025), for a further benefit specifying global focus identifiers.

Note

10. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

11. Claims 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda in view of Gajewska.

In regards to independent claim 6, Fukuda discloses a system for indicating input focus in a portal environment, the system comprising:

a focused style sheet and an unfocused style sheet (0064; Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that Fukuda teaching of a focus style sheet as applied to a focused portlet could also be applied as an unfocused style sheet to an unfocused portlet.);

a portal defining a plurality of portlets, said portlets comprising a single focused portlet configured for rendering according to said focused style sheet, and a remaining set of unfocused portlets configured for rendering according to said unfocused style sheet (0064; Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. It has been established that a portal is typically define with a plurality of portlets. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply Fukuda teachings to portlets);

Fukuda does not disclose expressly a global indicator disposed within said portal specifying said single focused portlet;

a global script disposed within said portal programmed to change said global indicator to specify a newly focused portlet when said newly focused portlet acquires

input focus from said single focused portlet, to re-render said newly focused portlet in said portal according to said focused style sheet and to re-render said single focused portlet in said portal according to said unfocused style sheet.

However Gajewska teaches a *global indicator disposed within said portal specifying said single focused portlet* (0042; Gajewska discloses a Focus List which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request);

a global script disposed within said portal programmed to change said global indicator to specify a newly focused portlet when said newly focused portlet acquires input focus from said single focused portlet, to re-render said newly focused portlet in said portal according to said focused style sheet and to re-render said single focused portlet in said portal according to said unfocused style sheet (0021; Gajewska discloses a component become the focus owner when it receives a FocusGained (*input focus*) event and ceases being the focus owner when it receives a FocusLost (*unfocused*) event. Gajewska further discloses in a FocusGain event, the opposite field specifies the component that is losing focus and specified the component that is gaining focus in conjunction with the FocusLost event; 0041, 0042, 100 in fig 6; Gajewska also discloses a Focus List (*global indicator*), which is a list of all the components making a request for a FocusGained event. The Focus List is structured as a queue (*global script*) of elements that are used when selecting the "opposite component.").

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda with Gajewska, for the benefit of maintaining a list of components requesting focus in a selected application which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request (0025).

In regards to dependent claim 7, Fukuda discloses the *system of claim 6, wherein said focused style sheet and unfocused style sheet are defined according to a content style sheet specification* (0064; Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes that the style sheet is used to configure both focused and unfocused styles. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan that the unfocused style is typically considered as the default style and thus may or may not be defined within the content style sheet specification.).

In regards to dependent claim 10, Fukuda does not disclose expressly the *system of claim 9, wherein at least one said attributes specifies a unique identifier for said single one of said portlets*.

However, Gajewska teaches the *system of claim 9, wherein at least one said attributes specifies a unique identifier for said single one of said portlets* (0042; Gajewska discloses a Focus List which identifies components(*portlets*) that have

Art Unit: 2176

issued a focus request. Each list element has a "requester" member. The "requester" member contains data that identifies (*unique identifier*) a component (*portlet*) that at some point issues a focus request).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda with Gajewska, for the benefit of maintaining a list of components requesting focus in a selected application which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request (0025).

In regards to dependent claim 11, Fukuda does not disclose expressly the *system of claim 9, wherein at least one of said attributes associates said global script with an event which occurs when said single one of said portlets acquires user input focus.*

However, Gajewska teaches the *system of claim 9, wherein at least one of said attributes associates said global script with an event which occurs when said single one of said portlets acquires user input focus* (0041, 0042, 100 in fig 6; Gajewska discloses a Focus List (*global indicator*), which is a list of all the components making a request for a FocusedGained event. The Focus List is structured as a queue (*global script*) of elements that are used when selecting the "opposite component.").

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda with Gajewska, for the benefit of maintaining a list of components requesting focus in a selected application which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request (0025).

In regards to dependent claim 13, Fukuda does not disclose expressly the *machine readable storage of claim 12, further comprising the steps of:*

defining a unique identifier in each portlet in said portal;
specifying a global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said focused portlet;
responsive to said new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus,
re-specifying said global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said new portlet.

However, Gajewska teaches the *machine readable storage of claim 12, further comprising the steps of* (0025, lines 1-5):

defining a unique identifier in each portlet in said portal (0042; Gajewska discloses a Focus List which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request. Each list element has a "requester" member. The "requester" member contains data that identifies (*unique identifier*) a component (*portlet*) that at some point issues a focus request);

specifying a global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said focused portlet (0042; Gajewska discloses a Focus List which identifies components(*portlets*) that

Art Unit: 2176

have issued a focus request. Each list element has a "requester" member. The "requester" member contains data that identifies (*unique identifier*) a component (*portlet*) that at some point issues a focus request);

responsive to said new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus, re-specifying said global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said new portlet (0043-0044; Gajewska discloses how a new "requester" member is added to the Focus List. The "requester" member contains data that identifies (*unique identifier*) a component (*portlet*) that at some point issues a focus request).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda with Gajewska, for the benefit of maintaining a list of components requesting focus in a selected application which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request (0025).

Note

12. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

13. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Gajewska, further in view of Ito et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0084405 A1; Filing Date: Oct. 7, 2002) (hereinafter "Ito").

In regards to dependent claim 3, Martin in view of Gajewska does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 2, further comprising the step of performing said re-assigning and re-rendering steps through a script embedded in said portal.*

However, Ito teaches *the method of claim 2, further comprising the step of performing said re-assigning and re-rendering steps through a script embedded in said portal* (0019, 0023-24, Ito teaches a style sheet selection method in which comprises a style sheet for embedding in the XML document. At the time of the invention, it was well known in the art that style sheets typically contain attributes/information that are specific to specific elements/objects, as well as scripts to perform specific functions on those elements/objects.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Martin in view of Gajewska with Ito. The motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit of dynamically selecting a style sheet for an XML document (portal) (0002)).

In regards to dependent claim 5, Martin does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 3, further comprising the step of associating said script with each*

event attribute in a divisible section which indicates when a corresponding one of said focused and unfocused portlets has acquired said input focus.

However, Gajewska teaches *the method of claim 3, further comprising the step of associating said script with each event attribute in a divisible section which indicates when a corresponding one of said focused and unfocused portlets has acquired said input focus* (0041, 0042, 100 in fig 6; Gajewska et al. also discloses a Focus List (*global indicator*), which is a list of all the components making a request for a FocusedGained event. The Focus List is structured as a queue (*global script*) of elements that are used when selecting the “opposite component”).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Martin with Gajewska for the benefit of maintaining a list of components requesting focus in a selected application (0025), for a further benefit specifying global focus identifiers.

14. Claims 9, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda in view of Gajewska, further in view of Ito et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0084405 A1; Filing Date: Oct. 7, 2002) (hereinafter “Ito”).

In regards to dependent claim 9, Fukuda in view of Gajewska does not disclose expressly *the system of claim 8, wherein each of said divisible sections comprises a set of attributes, at least one of said attributes specifying a class corresponding to one of said focused style sheet and unfocused style sheet.* Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus (0064).

Ito teaches *the system of claim 8, wherein each of said divisible sections comprises a set of attributes, at least one of said attributes specifying a class corresponding to one of said focused style sheet and unfocused style sheet* (0021-0024, Ito teaches how a style sheet satisfies the document type, root element name and root element *attribute* name).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda in view of Gajewska with Ito for the benefit of using style sheet for configuring *divisible sections comprises a set of attributes, at least one of said attributes specifying a class corresponding to one of said focused style sheet and unfocused style sheet.*

In regards to dependent claim 14, Fukuda in view of Gajewska does not disclose expressly *the machine readable storage of claim 13, further comprising the step of performing said re-assigning and re-rendering steps through a script embedded in said portal.*

However, Ito teaches *the machine readable storage of claim 13, further comprising the step of performing said re-assigning and re-rendering steps through a script embedded in said portal* (0019, 0021-24, Ito teaches a style sheet selection method in which comprises a style sheet for embedding in the XML document. Ito also teaches storage means for the style sheets and XML documents (Fig 1). At the time of the invention, it was well know in the art that style sheets typically contain attributes/information that are specific to specific elements/objects, as well as scripts to perform specific functions on those elements/objects.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include scripts with steps of *re-assigning and re-rendering* within the style sheets. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda in view of Gajewska with Ito. The motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit dynamically selecting a style sheet for an XML document (*portal*) (0002)).

In regards to dependent claim 16, Fukuda does not disclose expressly *the machine readable storage of claim 14, further comprising the step of associating said script with each event attribute in a divisible section which indicates when a corresponding one of said focused and unfocused portlets has acquired said input focus.*

However, Gajewska teaches *the machine readable storage of claim 14, further comprising the step of associating said script with each event attribute in a divisible section which indicates when a corresponding one of said focused and unfocused portlets has acquired said input focus* (0041, 0042, 100 in fig 6; Gajewska also discloses a Focus List (*global indicator*), which is a list of all the components making a request for a FocusedGained event. The Focus List is structured as a queue (*global script*) of elements that are used when selecting the "opposite component.").

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda with Gajewska, for the benefit of maintaining a list of components requesting focus in a selected application which identifies components(*portlets*) that have issued a focus request (0025).

Note

15. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

16. Claim 4, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin and Gajewska in view of Ito, further in view of Griffin (Pub. No.: US 2003/0126558 A1; Filing Date: Oct. 24, 2002).

In regards to dependent claim 4, Fukuda in view of Gajewska does not disclose expressly the *method of claim 3, further comprising the steps of:*

- defining said portal in a markup language document;*
- defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets; and,*
- performing said assigning and further assigning steps by specifying a class attribute for each of said focused and unfocused portlets, said class attribute corresponding to a style sheet selected from the group consisting of a focused style sheet and an unfocused style sheet.*

Ito teaches *performing said assigning and further assigning steps by specifying a class attribute for each of said focused and unfocused portlets, said class attribute corresponding to a style sheet selected from the group consisting of a focused style sheet and an unfocused style sheet* (0021-0024, Ito teaches how a style sheet satisfies the document type, root element name and root element *attribute* name).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include scripts with steps of *re-assigning and re-rendering* within the style sheets. The motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit dynamically selecting a style sheet for an XML document (*portal*) as taught by Ito; 0002.

Martin, Gajewska, and Ito fails to teach *defining said portal in a markup language document*;

defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets;

However, Griffin teaches *method of claim 3, further comprising the steps of: defining said portal in a markup language document (0014, lines 1-6); defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets (0015; Griffin teaches a portal page can include portlets)*;

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Griffin teachings of representing portals using XML data with Martin, Gajewska, and Ito with Griffin for the benefit of defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets.

Note

17. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2123.

18. Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda and Gajewska in view of Ito, further in view of Griffin (Pub. No.: US 2003/0126558 A1; Filing Date: Oct. 24, 2002).

In regards to dependent claim 8, Fukuda in view of Gajewska and Ito does not disclose expressly *the system of claim 6, wherein said portal comprises markup comprising a plurality of divisible sections, each of said divisible sections defining a single one of said portlets.*

However, Griffin teaches *the system of claim 6, wherein said portal comprises markup comprising a plurality of divisible sections, each of said divisible sections defining a single one of said portlets* (0015; Fig 1.; Griffin teaches a portal page can include portlets.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Griffin teachings of defining a portal in a markup language document (0014, lines 1-6), along with the established teaching of a markup language document being composed of divisible section, for the benefit of said portal comprises markup comprising a plurality of divisible sections, each of said divisible sections defining a single one of said portlets.

In regards to dependent claim 15, Fukuda in view of Gajewska does not disclose expressly *the machine readable storage of claim 14, further comprising the steps of:*

defining said portal in a markup language document;
defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said
focused and unfocused portlets; and,
performing said assigning and further assigning steps by
specifying a class attribute for each of said focused and unfocused portlets,
said class attribute corresponding to a style sheet selected from the group
consisting of said focused style sheet and said unfocused style sheet.

Ito teaches *performing said assigning and further assigning steps by specifying a*
class attribute for each of said focused and unfocused portlets, said class attribute
corresponding to a style sheet selected from the group consisting of a focused
style sheet and an unfocused style sheet (0021-0024, Ito teaches how a style sheet
satisfies the document type, root element name and root element *attribute* name).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to
include scripts with steps of *re-assigning and re-rendering* within the style sheets. The
motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit dynamically selecting a style
sheet for an XML document (*portal*) as taught by Ito; 0002.

Fukuda, Gajewska, and Ito fails to teach *defining said portal in a markup*
language document;
defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused
and unfocused portlets; and,

However, Griffin teaches *method of claim 3, further comprising the steps of:*
defining said portal in a markup language document (0014, lines 1-6);
defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets (0015; Griffin teaches a portal page can include portlets);

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ito teachings of configuring portlet attributes within a style sheet with Griffin teachings of representing portals using XML data with Fukuda, Gajewska, and Ito, for the benefit of defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets.

Note

19. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments, see Argument of Appeal Brief filed 28 Feb. 2007, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Martin, Fukuda, Gajewska, Griffin and Ito.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

William L Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER